

**NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS**

California Rules of Court, rule 8.1115(a), prohibits courts and parties from citing or relying on opinions not certified for publication or ordered published, except as specified by rule 8.1115(b). This opinion has not been certified for publication or ordered published for purposes of rule 8.1115.

**IN THE COURT OF APPEAL OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA**

**FOURTH APPELLATE DISTRICT**

**DIVISION TWO**

THE PEOPLE,

Plaintiff and Respondent,

v.

DANIEL JOHN GALVEZ,

Defendant and Appellant.

E042039

(Super.Ct.No. SWF017797)

**OPINION**

APPEAL from the Superior Court of Riverside County. Rodney L. Walker and James T. Warren, Judges. Affirmed.

John L. Staley, under appointment by the Court of Appeal, for Defendant and Appellant.

No appearance for Plaintiff and Respondent.

# I

## INTRODUCTION<sup>1</sup>

A felony complaint filed on August 29, 2006, alleged that defendant and appellant Daniel John Galvez (defendant) received stolen property in violation of Penal Code section 496, subdivision (a).<sup>2</sup> The complaint also alleged that defendant had been convicted of a violent or serious felony within the meaning of section 667, subdivisions (c) and (e)(1), and served a prison term within the meaning of section 667.5, subdivision (b).

On September 5, 2006, defendant, represented by counsel, pleaded guilty to the sole count of receiving stolen property and admitted the strike allegation, a violation of section 459. Defendant agreed to a sentence of 32 months in state prison with custody credits at eighty percent.

On October 16, 2006, the trial court sentenced defendant to 32 months in state prison, consistent with the plea bargain, awarded 79 days of custody credits, and imposed a restitution fine of \$400 and a parole revocation fine in the same amount.

---

<sup>1</sup> There was no preliminary hearing or probation report. At the guilty plea hearing, the parties stipulated that the factual basis for the plea would be based on the police and probation reports. These reports are not included in the record on appeal.

<sup>2</sup> All statutory references are to the Penal Code unless otherwise specified.

## II

### DISCUSSION

Defendant appealed, and upon his request this court appointed counsel to represent him. Counsel has filed a brief under the authority of *People v. Wende* (1979) 25 Cal.3d 436 and *Anders v. California* (1967) 386 U.S. 738 [87 S.Ct. 1396, 18 L.Ed.2d 493] setting forth a statement of the case, a summary of the facts, and potential arguable issues and requesting this court to undertake a review of the entire record.

We offered the defendant an opportunity to file a personal supplemental brief, which he has not done.

We have now concluded our independent review of the record and find no arguable issues.

The judgment is affirmed.

NOT TO BE PUBLISHED IN OFFICIAL REPORTS

RICHLI  
Acting P.J.

We concur:

KING  
J.

MILLER  
J.